Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

(1)

94 899 NOV 9 1994

No.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1994

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON,
Attorney General of Missouri,
Petitioner,

v.

HAROLD LYNCH, *et al.*,
Respondents.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON
Attorney General

DON M. DOWNING*
Deputy Attorney General

JANE E. EILERMANN
Assistant Attorney General

P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
(314) 751-3321

Counsel for Petitioner

*Counsel of Record

St. Louis Law Printing, Inc. 13307 Manchester Rd. St. Louis, MO 63131 314-231-4477

63 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Eleventh Amendment permits a Circuit Court of Appeals to remand an action against a State Attorney General for an evidentiary trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without deciding whether the relief sought by plaintiffs would violate the Eleventh Amendment.

2. Whether the Eleventh Amendment bars an action against a State Attorney General in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which challenges the constitutionality of a State statute, when the State Attorney General has no legal authority to enforce, has not attempted to enforce and has no connection whatsoever with the allegedly unconstitutional State statute.

3. Whether the Eleventh Amendment bars an action against a State Attorney General in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which challenges the constitutionality of a State statute, when the statute was fully implemented years ago and nothing under the statute remains to be enforced.

PARTIES TO THIS PROCEEDING

A complete list of the parties to the proceeding is contained in the caption to the June 20, 1994 opinion of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. Petition Appendix (hereinafter "Pet. App.") A-21 through A-22. The petitioner, a co-defendant below, is Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, the Attorney General of Missouri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented	i
Parties to the Proceeding	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Table of Authorities	v
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdictional Statement	2
Constitutional Provision Involved	2
Statement of the Case	2
1. Allegations of Plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint	2
2. Prior Proceedings	4
Reasons for Granting the Writ	7
1. The Eleventh Amendment prohibits a Circuit Court of Appeals from remanding an action against a State Attorney General for an evidentiary trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without deciding whether the relief sought by plaintiffs would violate the Eleventh Amendment.	9
A. The Court of Appeals' opinion remanding the case for a trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without determining whether plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General constitute a suit against the State of Missouri in violation	

of the Eleventh Amendment, denies States their fundamental Constitutional right not to be sued in federal court without consent, a right which cannot be vindicated without intervention from this Court..... 11

B. The Court of Appeals' opinion remanding the case for a trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without determining under the Eleventh Amendment what relief would be permissible, and against whom such relief would be appropriate, violates the Eleventh Amendment and is inconsistent with this Court's decision in *Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority v. Metcalf & Eddy, Inc.*, 506 U.S.___, 113 S.Ct. 684 (1993). 14

2. The Court of Appeals' opinion directly conflicts with this Court's opinion in *Ex parte Young*, and opinions in other Circuits which hold that in the absence of a sufficient connection between the official sued and enforcement of the allegedly unconstitutional statute, the suit constitutes a suit against the State in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. 16

3. The Eleventh Amendment bars an action against a State Attorney General in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which challenges the constitutionality of a State statute, when the statute was fully implemented years ago and nothing under the statute remains to be enforced. 21

Conclusion 28

Appendix A-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases:

Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak, 501 U.S. 775 (1991) 7,20

Cory v. White, 457 U.S. 85 (1982) 12,13,15

Edelman v. Jordan, 415 U.S. 651 (1974) ..... *passim*

Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908) ..... *passim*

Fitts v. McGhee, 172 U.S. 516 (1899) 18

Green v. Mansour, 474 U.S. 64 (1985) ..... *passim*

In re Ayers, 123 U.S. 443 (1887) 15

Kurz v. State of Michigan, 548 F.2d 172 (6th Cir. 1977) 19

Long v. Van de Kamp, 961 F.2d 151 (9th Cir. 1992) 19

Lynch v. Public School Retirement System of Missouri, 27 F.3d 336 (8th Cir. 1994) 1

Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265 (1986) ..... *passim*

Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89 (1984) ..... *passim*

Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority v. Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., 506 U.S. ___, 113 S.Ct. 684 (1993) ..... *passim*

Quern v. Jordan, 440 U.S. 332 (1978) 11

Sherman v. Community Consolidated School District 21 of Wheeling Township, 980 F.2d 437 (7th Cir. 1992) 19,20

Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Brown, 651 F.2d 613 (9th Cir. 1980) 19

Constitutional Provision:

U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 11 ..... *passim*

Statutes:

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... *passim*

Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.342 (Supp. 1991) ..... *passim*

Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.050.5 (Supp. 1991) 3

Mo. Rev. Stat. § 169.080 (1986) 22

No.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1994

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON,
Attorney General of Missouri,
Petitioner,

v.

HAROLD LYNCH, *et al.*,
Respondents.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OPINIONS BELOW

The August 20, 1993 order of the District Court has not been reported. It is reprinted at pages A-18 to A-20 of the accompanying appendix. The June 20, 1994 opinion of the Court of Appeals is reported at 27 F.3d 336 (8th Cir. 1994) and is reprinted at pages A-21 to A-26 of the appendix. The order of August 11, 1994 denying suggestions for rehearing en banc and rehearing by the panel is not reported. This order is reprinted at page A-27 of the appendix.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

The judgment of the Court of Appeals reversing the District Court's dismissal of plaintiffs' fourth amended complaint against the Attorney General of Missouri as violative of the Eleventh Amendment was entered on June 20, 1994. The order denying the petition for panel rehearing was entered on August 11, 1994. Jurisdiction for this Court rests on 28 U.S.C §1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

U.S. Const. Amend. XI: "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Allegations of Plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint

On April 28, 1993, plaintiffs, former and retired employees of the State of Missouri, filed their fourth amended complaint (hereinafter "plaintiffs' complaint") in the United States District Court, Western District of Missouri. Plaintiffs attempted to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Public School Retirement System of Missouri (hereinafter "PSRS"), its Board members, its Executive Secretary, and Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, the Attorney General of Missouri (hereinafter "Attorney General"), in his official and statutory capacity. See Appendix A, Pet. App. A-1 - A-13.

Count I of plaintiffs' complaint prays for a declaratory judgement that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.342 (Supp.1991) either on its face, as applied to plaintiffs, or both, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and results in a taking of plaintiffs' property in violation of the Due Process Clause of

the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Pet. App. A-10. This retirement election provision allowed then present employees of the State of Missouri to choose between two options. Firstly they could transfer from PSRS, a contributory retirement system, to the Missouri State Employees Retirement System (hereinafter "MOSERS"), a non-contributory retirement system with a refund of their PSRS retirement contributions. Alternatively they could choose to remain in PSRS with no refund of retirement contributions. Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.342 (Supp. 1991). Former or retired employees, like plaintiffs, remained in PSRS with the full benefits they contracted for when they were employees of the State of Missouri. Plaintiffs, as former State employees, contend that their exclusion from the election provision which provided a one time lump-sum refund of personal retirement contributions to then present employees upon their transfer to MOSERS violates the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. Pet. App. A-8 - A-9.

Count II of plaintiffs' complaint prays for an order enjoining defendants from maintaining and implementing the PSRS in a manner which violates the Equal Protection Clause, and an order that all personal retirement contributions made by plaintiffs during their employment with the State be refunded from PSRS without any diminution of benefits.[1] Count II further requests an order preventing enforcement against plaintiffs of that portion of Mo. Rev. Stat. §169.050.5 (Supp. 1991) which in the event all of

[1] Though plaintiffs' prayer for relief includes a request for an order enjoining "defendants" from maintaining or implementing the PSRS in a manner inconsistent with the Equal Protection Clause, paragraph 29 of plaintiffs' complaint specifically states that any available injunctive relief must be entered against the PSRS. Pet. App. A-10. The Eighth Circuit apparently interpreted these ambiguous allegations as a request for injunctive relief against the Attorney General. *See* Pet. App. A-25. For the reasons set forth below, any requested injunctive relief against the Attorney General would violate the Eleventh Amendment.

Mo Rev. Stat. §104.342 (Supp. 1991), is declared unconstitutional, would cause plaintiffs to forfeit any creditable service if their contributions are refunded. Pet. App. A-11 - A-12 . The result of plaintiffs' request, if granted, would be that they would be the only state employees, current or former, who would remain in PSRS with full benefits and nevertheless receive refunds of their retirement contributions.

Plaintiffs' complaint contains no allegation that the Attorney General of Missouri enforced, threatened to enforce, or had any legal authority to enforce the challenged statute against plaintiffs. The only allegation in the entire complaint against the Attorney General states as follows: "Defendant Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon is the Attorney General of the State of Missouri and maintains his official office at the permanent seat of government in Jefferson City, Cole County, Missouri. Defendant Nixon has the powers and duties provided by the Constitution and laws of the State of Missouri. Defendant Nixon is made a party hereto in his official capacity and in his statutory capacity." Pet. App. A-4, ¶10.

2. Prior Proceedings

In the District Court, the Attorney General filed a motion to dismiss plaintiffs' fourth amended complaint arguing, *inter alia*, that the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits this suit against the Attorney General. Pet. App. A-14 - A-15.[2] On August 20, 1993, the District Court dismissed

[2] The Attorney General also argued in support of his motion to dismiss that plaintiffs' complaint failed to present a "case or controversy," thus depriving the Court of Article III jurisdiction; and plaintiffs' complaint failed to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 under the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution in that the Attorney General, in his official capacity, is not a "person" for purposes of § 1983, plaintiffs failed to allege the deprivation of a substantive due process right, and plaintiffs complaint failed to state a claim for denial of equal protection. Pet. App. A-14 - A-15.

(Footnote 2 continued on next page)

plaintiffs' complaint against the Attorney General, holding "that plaintiffs' allegations against the Attorney General are barred by the Eleventh Amendment because plaintiffs do not seek prospective relief." Pet. App. A-19. The Court reasoned:

> Here, the relief sought by plaintiffs is retroactive in nature. There is simply no ongoing violation of federal law. Any alleged violation of federal law occurred in 1987 and 1989 when the then present state employees received refunds of their pension contributions to the exclusion of plaintiffs under §104.342. As the Attorney General notes, the refund scheme was fully completed in 1987 and 1989. The Attorney General does not continue to enforce the statute because it has already been fully implemented. This Court may not issue a declaratory judgement finding that the state or state official violated federal law in the past when there is no ongoing violation of federal law. *Green v. Mansour*, 106 S.Ct. 423, 438 (1985). Plaintiffs seek a cash reimbursement of their contributions because they allege the state violated their constitutional rights in the past when it did not grant them refunds. This request amounts to a retroactive damage award which is barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *See, Edelman*, 94 S.Ct. at 1358.

Pet. App. A-19 - A-20.

Plaintiffs appealed the dismissal to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals. In its order dated June 20, 1994, the Court of Appeals

---

(Footnote 2 continued)

The District Court did not reach any of these grounds, but dismissed plaintiffs' complaint against the Attorney General solely on Eleventh Amendment grounds. Pet. App. A-18 - A-20. The Court of Appeals did not address any of these issues — each of which could have served as an independent basis for affirming the District Court's judgment — but instead reversed the District Court's judgment solely because it disagreed with the District Court's interpretation of the Eleventh Amendment. Pet. App. A-21 - A-26.

reversed the District Court's dismissal of plaintiffs' complaint as to the Attorney General concluding, "that summary judgement in favor of PSRS and the Attorney General was not appropriate." Pet. App. A-25.[3] The Court rejected the District Court's Eleventh Amendment analysis and held:

> If the statutory scheme is in fact unconstitutional, the continued implementation of such a scheme constitutes an ongoing violation of federal law, regardless of whether some or all persons similarly situated to plaintiffs have already received their refunds.
>
> At this time we need not determine the outer limits of the district court's authority to order particular remedies, such as refunds to plaintiffs. It is sufficient for now to say that the district court clearly has the authority to find the statutory scheme unconstitutional and to order an appropriate remedy.

Pet. App. A-25 (footnote omitted). The Court remanded the action for an "evidentiary hearing" on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims. Pet. App. A-26. The Court "retain[ed] jurisdiction" over the case and directed the District Court to certify to it findings of fact and conclusions of law based on the evidentiary hearing. Pet. App. A-26.

On July 18, 1994, the Attorney General petitioned for rehearing and filed suggestions for rehearing en banc arguing, *inter alia*, that the Eleventh Amendment prohibited plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General. The petition and suggestion were denied by the Court of Appeals on August 11, 1994. Appendix E, Pet. App. A-19.

---

[3] The Court erroneously referred to the Attorney General's motion as a motion for summary judgement. The Attorney General filed a motion to dismiss after being added as a party to plaintiffs' fourth amended complaint. The Attorney General based its motion and the District Court based its ruling solely on the allegations contained in plaintiffs' fourth amended complaint.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Preliminary Statement

The Eleventh Amendment symbolizes the principle that in joining the federal Union, States did not surrender all incidents of their sovereignty. Among the attributes of sovereignty that States retained was their sovereign immunity - including immunity from suit in federal court. *Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Authority v. Metcalf & Eddy*, 506 U.S. ___, 113 S.Ct. 684, 689 (1993). The Eleventh Amendment, which provides this immunity from suit in federal court, stands not so much for what it says, but for the understanding of our constitutional structure which it confirms: that states retained their sovereign immunity upon joining the federal Union; that the federal judicial authority is limited by that sovereignty; and that States will not be subject to suit without its consent. *Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak*, 501 U.S. 775, 779 (1991). This Court has scrupulously guarded the fundamenal protection of the Eleventh Amendment in recognition of the prominent role of state sovereignty in our federalist system.

The decision of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals below effectively obliterates the fundamental protection afforded States by the Eleventh Amendment. It did so in three ways. First, by allowing a suit against a State official in the absence of any connection between that official and the State statute that allegedly violated the complainant's rights, it is allowing a suit against the State sovereign itself. No principle in Eleventh Amendment immunity jurisprudence is more inviolate than the principle that a State, without consent, may not be sued in federal court regardless of the relief sought. *Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984). The Eighth Circuit's decision not only conflicts with this Court's decision in *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), but decisions in other Circuits which hold, that in the absence of a sufficient connection

between the official sued and the enforcement of the allegedly unconstitutional State statute, the action constitutes a suit against the State in violation of the Eleventh Amendment.

If left unchecked, this decision will have devastating consequences on States and their officials because it effectively allows perspective plaintiffs to sue any State official in order to get a judgment against the State itself. This is a complete end run around the Eleventh Amendment that will expand exponentially the number of federal court lawsuits which heretofore have been barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

Secondly, the Court of Appeals decision allows claims against State officials for retrospective relief in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. This Court held in *Young* that suits against State officials for prospective injunctive relief are not suits against the State itself in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. The Court carved out this exception to immunity in order to balance the necessity that State officials comply with federal law with the State's fundamental right not to be sued in federal court. *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 688-89, and *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 278 (1986). The Eighth Circuit's opinion — which allows a suit to determine the constitutionality of a State statute that was fully implemented over 5 years ago and nothing under the statute remains to be implemented — does not serve the federal interests in ensuring the Supremacy of federal law. A declaration regarding that statute, and any monetary relief ordered ancillary to such a declaration, would necessarily be retrospective in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. This type of compensatory or deterrence relief to vindicate an alleged past violation of federal law is not sufficient to overcome the dictates of the Eleventh Amendment, and do not serve the policy underlying the *Young* exception to immunity.

In the final blow to the Eleventh Amendment protection afforded States, the Eighth Circuit's ruling requires States to go

to trial on the substantive merits of plaintiffs' constitutional claims before a determination is made on whether the relief sought by the plaintiffs would violate the Eleventh Amendment. "[T]he value to the States of their Eleventh Amendment immunity..., is for the most part lost as litigation proceeds past motion practice." *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 688. The Court of Appeals opinion neglected to address, much less resolve, the fundamental questions of whether the suit against the State official is in reality a suit against the State, what relief is permissible and against whom such relief would be appropriate, consistent with the Eleventh Amendment. This holding subjects States to litigation on the merits of constitutional claims without determining whether Eleventh Amendment would bar such claims. This in and of itself violates the Eleventh Amendment and is inconsistent with this Court's decision in *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*. Not only will this decision put enormous litigation burdens on States and their officials, but it will clog the federal court's with trials on substantive claims that ultimately will have proven to be unnecessary. Without intervention from this Court, the State of Missouri and potentially every State will be stripped of its fundamental constitutional right not to be sued in federal court.

For all of these reasons and the reasons set forth below, this Court should grant certiorari and ultimately reverse the Eighth Circuit's erroneous decision.

1. The Eleventh Amendment prohibits a Circuit Court of Appeals from remanding an action against a State Attorney General for an evidentiary trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without deciding whether the relief sought by plaintiffs would violate the Eleventh Amendment.

The Eighth Circuit in this case completely abdicated its responsibility under the Eleventh Amendment to resolve, *before* ordering a trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims,

whether the Attorney General is entitled to immunity from suit in federal court. By reversing the District Court's determination that plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General are barred by the Eleventh Amendment, and remanding the case for an evidentiary hearing on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims, the court denied the Attorney General Eleventh Amendment immunity. Denial of the Attorney General's "claims to Eleventh Amendment immunity purport to be a conclusive determination[ ] that [he has] no right not to be sued in federal court." *Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority v. Metcalf & Eddy, Inc.*, 506 U.S. ___, 113 S.Ct. 684, 688 (1993).

The Eleventh Amendment provides States and their officials a fundamental constitutional protection inherent in our form of government. Any court opinion — particularly a Circuit Court of Appeals opinion — that effectively eliminates that protection, as the decision below does here, is of grave constitutional importance to every state.

The Court of Appeals entire Eleventh Amendment analysis below was:

> If the statutory scheme is in fact unconstitutional, the continued implementation of such a scheme constitutes an ongoing violation of federal law, regardless of whether some or all persons similarly situated to plaintiffs have already received their refunds.
>
> At this time we need not determine the outer limits of the district court's authority to order particular remedies, such as refunds to plaintiffs. It is sufficient for now to say that the district court clearly has the authority to find the statutory scheme unconstitutional and to order an appropriate remedy.

Pet. App. A-25. It is clear that the Court of Appeals reversed the District Court solely on the basis that it believed that if the statute is unconstitutional, there is an "ongoing violation of federal

law." This superficial — and erroneous — analysis of the Eleventh Amendment issue completely ignores the fundamental question of whether plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General constitute a suit against the State of Missouri, which cannot proceed regardless of the relief sought. It also failed to heed the express admonition of this Court in *Puerto Rico Aqueduct* that the Eleventh Amendment issue be resolved *before* any other proceedings are allowed to go forward. Both of these errors seriously undermine the fundamental protections given States by the Eleventh Amendment, and must be clearly and expressly rejected by this Court.

A. The Court of Appeals' opinion remanding the case for a trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without determining whether plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General constitute a suit against the State of Missouri in violation of the Eleventh Amendment, denies States their fundamental Constitutional right not to be sued in federal court without consent, a right which cannot be vindicated without intervention from this Court.

The Eleventh Amendment protects States from being sued in federal court. "[I]n the absence of consent a suit in which the State or one of its agencies or departments is named as the defendant is proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment." *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 276 (1986), quoting *Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984), and *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 687-88.[4] "This withdrawal of jurisdiction effectively confers immunity from suit." *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 687. "This jurisdictional bar applies

---

[4] In enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. §1983, the statute at issue in this case, Congress did not abrogate the Eleventh Amendment immunity of the States. *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 676-77 (1974), and reaffirmed in *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 338-345 (1978).

regardless of the nature of the relief sought." *Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 100.

When a suit is brought against state officials, the first question to be resolved is whether the suit is actually a suit against the state itself. *Id.* at 101. "It is ... well established that even though a State is not named a party to the action, the suit may nonetheless be barred by the Eleventh Amendment." *Edelman*, 415 U.S. at 663. "And, as when the State itself is named as the defendant, a suit against state officials that is in fact a suit against a State is barred regardless of whether it seeks damages or injunctive relief." *Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 102, citing *Cory v. White*, 457 U.S. 85, 91(1982).

The Court of Appeals, thus was required — as a matter of federal court jurisdiction — to determine whether plaintiffs' action against the Attorney General constituted a suit against the State of Missouri. It plainly did not even address that issue. The Court simply proceeded to determine whether the relief sought was retrospective or prospective in nature, an analysis that becomes relevant *only if* the suit does not constitute a suit against the State itself.

In its opinion, the Court of Appeals relied solely on its belief that the continued implementation of the allegedly unconstitutional statutory scheme constitutes an ongoing violation of federal law. For this reason, the Court presumably believed that plaintiffs' suit fell within the very narrow exception to the general principle of immunity carved out by this Court in *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908).[5]

---

[5] In that case, the Court held that the Eleventh Amendment does not prevent federal courts from ordering prospective injunctive relief against state officials "to prevent a continuing violation of federal law," *Green v. Mansour*, 474 U.S. 64, 68 (1985), citing *Young*, 209 U.S. at 155-56, "Remedies designed to end a continuing violation of federal law are necessary to vindicate the federal interest in assuring the supremacy of that law." *Green*, 474 U.S. at 68, citing *Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 102.

The analysis utilized by the Court of Appeals, while erroneous in and of itself,[6] omitted the threshold inquiry required by *Young* itself - namely whether the official sued has the requisite connection with the enforcement of the allegedly unconstitutional statute to justify the removal of immunity necessary to vindicate the federal interest in assuring compliance with federal law. As the Court in *Young* expressly recognized: "In making an officer of the state a party defendant in a suit to enjoin the enforcement of an act alleged to be unconstitutional, it is plain that such officer must have some connection with the enforcement of the act, or else it is merely making him a party as a representative of the state, and thereby attempting to make the state a party." *Young*, 209 U.S. at 158.[7]

In denying the Attorney General Eleventh Amendment immunity based solely on its erroneous analysis of whether plaintiffs claims for relief are prospective under *Young*, the Eighth Circuit failed to address the most fundamental component of Eleventh Amendment immunity analysis - namely whether this lawsuit against the Attorney General is actually a suit against the State of Missouri, which absent a waiver of Eleventh Amendment immunity, cannot proceed regardless of the relief sought. *Cory*, 457 U.S. at 90-91. The Attorney General and the State of Missouri are entitled to have this fundamental question determined before being subjected to defending the merits of plaintiffs' underlying action. *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 688.

---

[6] As will be explained in Section 3 of this petition, even were this Court to apply the analysis of *Young* to the Attorney General's conduct, it is clear that implementation of this statute was fully completed 5-7 years ago when the then present employees received refunds of their personal contributions to the exclusion of plaintiffs. Thus, the relief requested by plaintiffs is retrospective in nature and would violate the Eleventh Amendment in any event. *See Green*, 474 U.S. at 73 and *Edelman*, 415 U.S. at 668.

[7] As explained below in Section 2 of this petition, the Attorney General does not come close to having such a connection with the State statute at issue in this case.

Without intervention from this Court, this case will be returned to the District Court for a evidentiary hearing on the merits of the underlying action, and the State of Missouri — and ultimately every State within the Eighth Circuit — will be stripped of the "fundamental constitutional protection" afforded to it by the Eleventh Amendment. *Id.* Because any of the relief requested by plaintiffs against the Attorney General would in essence be a judgement against the State of Missouri, which in this case could result in a substantial money judgement and the dismantling of two State retirement systems, it is critically important that this Court take this Petition and reverse the Eighth Circuit's plainly erroneous denial of Eleventh Amendment immunity to the State of Missouri.

B. The Court of Appeals' opinion remanding the case for a trial on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims without determining under the Eleventh Amendment what relief would be permissible, and against whom such relief would be appropriate, violates the Eleventh Amendment and is inconsistent with this Court's decision in *Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority v. Metcalf & Eddy, Inc.*, 506 U.S.___, 113 S.Ct. 684 (1993).

The inquiry necessary to determine whether a suit violates the Eleventh Amendment is impossible without looking at the substance of the claims involved and the identity of the parties against whom such claims are made. Yet the Court of Appeals opinion in this case did not distinguish between the parties involved. In fact, the Court flatly refused to examine the permissible scope of available remedies to determine if any remedies against the Attorney General would violate the Eleventh Amendment. Pet. App. A-25.

The Court of Appeals specifically held that "[a]t this time we need not determine the outer limits of the district court's authority to order particular remedies, such as refunds to the plaintiffs." *Id.* The Court further stated that the District Court clearly has the

authority to declare the statutory scheme unconstitutional and to order an appropriate remedy.[8] The Court then remanded the case to the District Court for an evidentiary hearing on plaintiffs' substantive constitutional claims and ordered the District Court to certify to it findings of fact and conclusions of law.[9] This opinion fails to give sufficient direction to the District Court as to what type of relief is permissible, and against whom the relief would be appropriate, consistent with the Eleventh Amendment.

---

[8]Though it appears from this statement that the Court believed plaintiffs' claim for declaratory relief would be appropriate, the Court failed to indicate whether this relief could appropriately be ordered against the Attorney General. This omission is characteristic of the Court's failure to distinguish the various Eleventh Amendment issues distinct to each party defendant.

To the extent the Court held that declaratory relief could properly be ordered against the Attorney General, such holding is in error. As explained below in Section 2 of this petition, since the Attorney General has no connection whatsoever with the statute that allegedly violated plaintiffs' rights, plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General constitute a suit against the State of Missouri. Thus, all of plaintiffs' claims, whether in law or equity, are barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. at 158 and *Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 102, citing *Cory*, 457 U.S. at 91. Further, as explained below in Section 3, even if the Attorney General is an appropriate official to be sued, any declaration that a statute that was fully implemented 5 years ago is unconstitutional would necessarily be retrospective in nature, and in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. *Green*, 474 U.S. at 73.

[9]Though the Court retained jurisdiction over this case awaiting the District Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, presumably giving it the opportunity to determine later whether the remedies ordered by the District Court against the Attorney General violate the Eleventh Amendment, this in no way ameliorates the harm caused the State of Missouri and the Attorney General in being subjected to defending a trial of plaintiffs' constitutional claims when it is immune, not just from liability but from suit. "[T]he value to the states of their Eleventh Amendment immunity..., is for the most part lost as litigation proceeds past motion practice." *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 688. "The very object and purpose of the 11th Amendment were to prevent the indignity of subjecting a State to the coercive process of judicial tribunals at the instance of private parties." *Id.* at 689, quoting *In re Ayers*, 123 U.S. 443, 505 (1887).

A motion to dismiss on Eleventh Amendment grounds made by a State or its officials involves a claim to a fundamental constitutional protection whose resolution generally has no bearing on the merits of the case. *Puerto Rico Aqueduct,* 113 S.Ct. at 668. The very object and purpose of the Eleventh Amendment immunity is not to provide a defense to liability, but to prevent states from being sued in the first instance. *Id.* at 689. Thus a state or its officials have the right to have the question of immunity determined *before* they are subjected to suit on the merits of any constitutional claim. *Id.* at 688-689. This fundamental entitlement to immunity from suit is effectively lost if a case is erroneously permitted to be tried on the merits. *Id.* at 687. The type of relief granted and against whom such relief is granted are essential elements in determining whether the Eleventh Amendment applies to plaintiffs' claims. Yet the Eighth Circuit's holding is unclear as to what type of relief is appropriate and against whom such relief would be proper under the Eleventh Amendment. Thus this holding subjects the State of Missouri and its Attorney General to litigation on the merits of the underlying constitutional claims without determining whether the Eleventh Amendment would bar such a suit. This in and of itself violates the Eleventh Amendment and is inconsistent with this Court's decision in *Puerto Rico Aqueduct. Id.* at 688-689.

2. The Court of Appeals' opinion directly conflicts with this Court's opinion in *Ex parte Young*, and opinions in other Circuit opinions which hold that in the absence of a sufficient connection between the official sued and enforcement of the allegedly unconstitutional statute, the suit constitutes a suit against the State in violation of the Eleventh Amendment.

As stated above, the Court of Appeals decision reversing the dismissal of plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General as violative of the Eleventh Amendment wholly neglected to address, much less resolve, the fundamental issue of whether the

Attorney General is sufficiently connected to the enforcement of the statute that allegedly violated plaintiffs' constitutional rights to allow suit consistent with the Eleventh Amendment. If the Court had made this most basic inquiry, it is clear from plaintiffs' complaint that the Attorney General lacks any connection with the enforcement of the statute that allegedly violated their rights. Since this suit against the Attorney General is in all respects a suit against the State of Missouri in violation of the Eleventh Amendment, regardless of the relief sought, it must be dismissed.

The Court of Appeals opinion reversing the District Court's dismissal is in direct conflict with this Court's decision in *Ex parte Young*. In *Ex parte Young*, the Minnesota Attorney General was enforcing unconstitutional transportation rates established by state statute to the penal detriment of plaintiffs while under a contempt order from the District Court. The *Young* Court carved out a very narrow exception to Eleventh Amendment immunity allowing an injunction against the Attorney General to prevent him from pursuing criminal sanctions against the plaintiffs. *Young*, 209 U.S. at 156. It was clear in that case that the Attorney General was statutorily charged with the duty of enforcing the unconstitutional law and thus was the proper party to enjoin. *Id.* at 160-161. In reaching its conclusion that a suit against a State attorney general for prospective injunctive relief does not constitute a suit against the State itself in violation of the Eleventh Amendment, the Court held that "[i]n making an officer of the state a party defendant in a suit to enjoin the enforcement of an act alleged to be unconstitutional, it is plain that such officer must have some connection with the enforcement of the act, or else it is merely making him a party as a representative of the state, and thereby attempting to make the state a party." *Id.* at 158.

The theory underlying the *Young* exception to immunity is that a state official, when acting pursuant to an unconstitutional law, is "stripped of his official or representative character and is

subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct." *Id.* at 160. This individual action does not "impart to [the official] any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States." *Id.* On the other hand, if the official with a sufficient connection with the enforcement of the illegal provision is not properly joined as a defendant,

> then the constitutionality of every act passed by the legislature could be tested by a suit against the governor and the attorney general, based on the theory that the former, as the executive of the state, was, in a general sense, charged with the execution of all its laws, and the latter, as attorney general, might represent the state in litigation involving the enforcement of its statutes. That would be a very convenient way for obtaining a speedy judicial determination of questions of constitutional law which may be raised by individuals, but it is a mode which cannot be applied to the states of the Union consistently with the fundamental principle that they cannot, without their assent, be brought into any court at the suit of private persons.

Id. at 158, quoting *Fitts v. McGhee*, 172 U.S. 516, 530 (1899).

It is clear from the face of plaintiffs' complaint that the Attorney General had no connection with the enforcement of the statute that allegedly violated their constitutional rights. Plaintiffs' complaint fails to allege one fact that indicates that the Attorney General threatened to enforce, enforced, or had any legal authority to enforce the provision in question against plaintiffs. In fact, plaintiffs would be unable to assert any such facts because the Attorney General had no authority, statutory or otherwise, to enforce the statute. Plaintiffs themselves admit that any available injunctive relief should be entered against the PSRS. Pet. App. A-10, ¶ 29. The fact that plaintiffs admit that there is no injunctive relief available against the Attorney General confirms that he has no connection with the enforcement of the statute and that there is absolutely no conduct of his to restrain

or conform to federal law. The Court of Appeals' decision allowing the Attorney General to remain a party to this lawsuit absent any connection with the enforcement of the statutory scheme that allegedly violated plaintiffs' rights effectively allows a suit against the State of Missouri in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. This contradicts not only the holding, but the core policy behind this Court's decision in *Young*.

The Court of Appeals decision also conflicts with decisions in other circuits which have examined the connection necessary to sue a state official in his official capacity consistent with the Eleventh Amendment. The common theme in all these cases is that the official sued must have sufficient connection with the enforcement of the statute that deprives plaintiffs of their constitutional violations or the suit is nothing more than an attempt to sue the State itself in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. *Sherman v. Community Consolidated School District 21 of Wheeling Township*, 980 F.2d 437 (7th Cir. 1992) (claims against the Attorney General dismissed in action challenging constitutionality of state statute requiring recitation of Pledge of Allegiance as a suit against the state in violation of the Eleventh Amendment where Attorney General never threatened plaintiffs with prosecution and had no authority to do so); *Long v. Van de Kamp*, 961 F.2d 151 (9th Cir. 1992) (Eleventh Amendment barred claims against Attorney General because his supervisory powers were not sufficient to establish requisite connection with enforcement of the statute that allegedly deprived plaintiffs of their constitutional rights and there was no threat that statute would be enforced by Attorney General); *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Brown*, 651 F.2d 613 (9th Cir. 1980)(claims against Attorney General constituted claims against the State of Oregon because he did not have "some connection" with the enforcement of the statute); and *Kurz v. State of Michigan*, 548 F.2d 172 (6th Cir. 1977) (claims against Solicitor General constituted claims against the State of Michigan).

Because the Attorney General has not threatened to enforce, has not enforced and has no authority to enforce the statutory provision that allegedly violated plaintiffs' constitutional rights, plaintiffs' claims are in essence a suit against the State of Missouri and should be dismissed regardless of the relief sought. The only benefit to having the Attorney General as a party to this lawsuit is to obtain a judgement binding on the State of Missouri "as an entity, a step that Congress did not authorize when enacting 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and that the eleventh amendment does not permit in the absence of such authorization." *Sherman*, 980 F.2d at 441.

The Eighth Circuit's ruling allowing the Attorney General to remain a party to this lawsuit subjects the State of Missouri to suit. This seriously undermines the fundamental protection of the Eleventh Amendment, and intrudes upon the inviolate principles of federalism inherent in the Eleventh Amendment. *See Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 689.

> Despite the narrowness of its terms, [this Court has]...understood the Eleventh Amendment to stand not so much for what it says, but for the presupposition of our constitutional structure which it confirms: that the States entered the federal system with their sovereignty intact; that the judicial authority in Article III is limited by this sovereignty, and that a State will therefore not be subject to suit in federal court unless it has consented to suit, either expressly or in the "plan of the convention."

Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak, 501 U.S. 775, 779 (1991) (internal citations omitted). To so cavalierly dismiss Missouri's claim to immunity is contrary to the importance this Court has placed considerable importance on the Eleventh Amendment and the federalism principles it represents.

3. The Eleventh Amendment bars an action against a State Attorney General in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which challenges the constitutionality of a State statute, when the statute was fully implemented years ago and nothing under the statute remains to be enforced.

Assuming the Attorney General is a proper party to this lawsuit (as explained above he is not), plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General — which seek only retrospective relief — are nonetheless barred by the Eleventh Amendment. In reversing the District Court's dismissal of plaintiffs' claims against the Attorney General, the Court of Appeals relied upon an erroneous characterization of the nature of the alleged constitutional violation and the nature of the relief sought by plaintiffs in denying the Attorney General Eleventh Amendment immunity.

The alleged constitutional violation is not, as the Court of Appeals stated, "ongoing" under any heretofore recognized legal or common sense meaning of that term; rather, it occurred 5 to 7 years ago when refunds were made to certain PSRS members, and not to plaintiffs. As the District Court found, the statute under which those refunds were made has been fully implemented; absolutely nothing remains to be completed. Under decisions of this Court, that type of past alleged unconstitutional action cannot be deemed "ongoing" for purposes of the Eleventh Amendment. Moreover, the only substantive relief plaintiffs have ever sought in this action is a refund of their past contributions. That type of retrospective relief likewise is barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

In the five complaints filed over the four year history of the litigation, plaintiffs have been very clear about the only remedies they seek: a declaration that §104.342 is unconstitutional and an injunction requiring PSRS to refund their past retirement contri-

butions.[10] The Court of Appeals rejected the District Court's finding that these claims against the Attorney General are barred by the Eleventh Amendment, holding that "[i]f the statutory scheme is in fact unconstitutional, the continued implementation of such a scheme constitutes an ongoing violation of federal law." Pet. App. A-25. Under cases decided by this Court,

---

[10] In its opinion, the Court of Appeals indicated that "the district court at least could require PSRS to recover the refunds already made pursuant to an unconstitutional scheme." Pet. App. A-25. Plaintiffs have never sought, and have repeatedly disavowed their intention to seek, any order requiring PSRS to recover the refunds already made to thousands of former PSRS members. (To be eligible to receive refunds, these people were required to transfer to MOSERS.) For good reason, that type of relief would be problematic for a number of reasons.

First, this remedy would result in no financial benefit to plaintiffs and would do absolutely nothing to change their legal rights with regard to the PSRS. Additionally, this remedy would raise serious ethical issues for plaintiffs' counsel in that he represented the state employees in the prior District Court cases, the settlement of which resulted in the legislature's passage of the refund scheme at issue in this appeal. Thus this remedy would compromise the potential property interests of his former clients who are not parties to this case. Such a remedy would also impose a tremendous hardship on those thousands of nonparty former PSRS members, who may well have already spent most, if not all, of the refund moneys they received years ago. That remedy itself would raise serious constitutional issues. It thus is hardly surprising that plaintiffs have never requested, plead, or argued for that remedy in over four years of litigation.

Secondly, the PSRS has no legal authority to retrieve the refunds already made. First, the people who already have received refunds are now members of MOSERS and PSRS's authority to adjust benefits for overpayment to its members under Mo. Rev. Stat. § 169.080 (1986) does not extend to members of MOSERS. Additionally, the refunds already given to these former PSRS members were funded by the Missouri legislature. Because the State of Missouri would be the real party in interest in a lawsuit to retrieve the refunds already given, PSRS would not have standing to recover the funds for the State of Missouri. Since the State of Missouri cannot be a party to this lawsuit because of the Eleventh Amendment, *see Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 100, this remedy is unavailable to plaintiffs.

plaintiffs' alleged constitutional violation can not be deemed "ongoing" for purposes of the Eleventh Amendment. Because the Eighth Circuit relied on this erroneous characterization of what constitutes "ongoing" in denying the Attorney General Eleventh Amendment immunity, its decision should be reversed.

Though *Ex Parte Young* held that the Eleventh Amendment does not prevent federal courts from ordering prospective injunctive relief against state officials "to prevent a continuing violation of federal law," *Green,* 474 U.S. at 68, citing *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. at 155-56, this Court has explicitly "refused to extend the reasoning of *Young*..., to claims for retrospective relief." *Green*, 474 U.S. at 68. *Young*'s applicability has been tailored to conform to those situations where the violation

> *is ongoing as opposed to cases in which federal law has been violated at one time or over a period of time in the past,* as well as on cases in which the relief against the state official directly ends the violation of federal law as opposed to cases in which that relief is intended indirectly to encourage compliance with federal law through deterrence or directly to meet third-party interests such as compensation.

Papasan, 478 U.S. at 277-78 (emphasis added). This bar against retrospective relief has been extended to prohibit a federal court from issuing a declaratory judgement that a state or state officials violated federal law in the past when there is no ongoing violation of federal law. *Green*, 474 U.S. at 73.

In this case, as the District Court held, "[t]here is simply no ongoing violation of federal law." Pet. App. A-19. The former employees plainly alleged that it is the "implementation and enforcement" of Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.342 (Supp. 1991) that allegedly violated their constitutional rights. Pet. App. A-8 at ¶ 22. By the express terms of that statute, full implementation

and enforcement of that provision occurred in 1987 and 1989 when the then present employees received refunds of their PSRS contributions. Because the statute that allegedly violated plaintiffs' rights was fully implemented five years ago, there is no future conduct to enjoin, no ongoing violation of federal law, and no valid basis for prospective injunctive relief under *Young*.

Any declaration that the Attorney General acted unconstitutionally in the past would serve no purpose except to allow the former employees to attempt to offer that declaration in the state proceeding (which was filed by plaintiffs on October 15, 1993) as evidence on the issue of liability. The plaintiffs then could claim the only remaining issue for the State court to decide would be the amount of damages. If such a declaratory order were allowed, it "would have the same effect as a full-fledged award of damages or restitution by the federal court." *Green*, 474 U.S. at 73. The Court of Appeals decision, which presumably would allow the District Court to order such a declaration, would constitute the type of end run around the Eleventh Amendment, this Court prohibited in *Green*. *Id.*

As the District Court held, plaintiffs' claim for so called "injunctive relief" is nothing more than a request for a "cash reimbursement of their contributions because they allege the state violated their constitutional rights in the past when it did not grant them refunds. This request amounts to a retroactive damage award which is barred by the Eleventh Amendment." Pet.App. A-20.

The policy underlying the *Young* exception to immunity is to balance the necessity to insure that State officials comply with federal law with the fundamental right of a State and its officials to be free from suit in federal court. See *Puerto Rico Aqueduct*, 113 S.Ct. at 688-89, and *Papasan*, 474 U.S. at 278. This Court has concluded the line between prospective and retrospective relief is the appropriate one to use in reconciling these competing

constitutional concerns. *Papasan*, 474 U.S at 277-79. Compensatory or deterrence interests to vindicate a past violation of federal law are not sufficient to overcome the dictates of the Eleventh Amendment, and do not serve the policy underlying the *Young* exception to immunity. *Id* at 278, citing *Green*, 474 U.S. at 68.

Plaintiffs' request for so-called "injunctive" relief in this case is exactly the type of retrospective relief this Court in *Edelman* held was barred by the Eleventh Amendment. The *Edelman* plaintiffs requested an injunction to require state officials to remit public aid unconstitutionally withheld. 415 U.S. at 656. The Court in *Edelman* held that even though the request was "phrased" as a request for prospective injunctive relief, it was in practical effect indistinguishable from a retroactive award of damages against the State which is prohibited by the Eleventh Amendment. *Id.* at 668. Plaintiffs' request for the release of their public aid benefits illegally withheld was not a request for a valid injunction to ensure future compliance with federal law. Their request, which was "measured in terms of a monetary loss resulting from a past breach of a legal duty on the part of the defendant state officials " was in reality a request for a retrospective damage award in violation of the Eleventh Amendment. *Id.*

Plaintiffs' request for an order enjoining defendants to refund all their PSRS contributions is indistinguishable from the relief prohibited in *Edelman*. The relief requested in *Edelman* and the relief requested here is not remedial, designed to prevent future alleged constitutional violations, but is a compensatory remedy measured in terms of an alleged past breach of duty. It is their exclusion from the refund scheme that is plaintiffs' grievance. The time to prevent the alleged violation of federal law with a valid prospective injunction was before the refunds were given to the thousands of PSRS members to the exclusion of plaintiffs. That time has long since passed and any attempt to redress plaintiffs' claims would necessarily be retrospective.

Plaintiffs attempt to plead a continuing wrong to justify "injunctive relief" by alleging that the PSRS is refusing to refund plaintiffs' contributions (There is no allegation that the Attorney General is withholding plaintiffs' contributions; any such allegation would be frivolous as it is clear he has no power to do so.). Pet. App. A-10 - A-11. This attempt to phrase the request for damages as a request to enjoin the PSRS to release refunds of plaintiffs' contribution is the exact type of maneuver the Court in *Edelman* held violative of the Eleventh Amendment. *Edelman*, 415 U.S. at 668.

This Court in *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. at 280, reiterated the same point. The *Papasan* plaintiffs claimed that a past distribution of certain trust funds by the State of Mississippi violated the Equal Protection Clause and sought to have the trust corpus funds replaced. *Id.* To attempt to avoid *Edelman's* holding, the *Papasan* plaintiffs characterized their claim as seeking prospective, injunctive relief to prohibit a continuing violation of federal law. *Id.* In ruling that the Eleventh Amendment barred such a claim, this Court relied upon the obvious similarity of that claim to the claim presented in Edelman:

> The characterization in [*Edelman*] of the legal wrong as the continuing withholding of accrued benefits is very similar to the petitioners' characterization of the legal wrong here as the breach of a continuing obligation to comply with the trust obligations. ***We discern no substantive difference between a not-yet-extinguished liability for a past breach of trust and the continuing obligation to meet trust responsibilities asserted by the petitioners.***

Papasan, 478 U.S. at 280. (emphasis added)

Here, as in *Papasan*, there is no constitutionally significant distinction between the alleged "not-yet-extinguished liability" for the past, allegedly unconstitutional, distribution of refunds and the supposed "continuing obligation" to provide equal

refunds. Thus, regardless of semantics, plaintiffs' claims are barred under both *Edelman* and *Papasan*.[11]

The Eighth Circuit's opinion obliterates the distinction between retrospective and prospective relief carefully crafted by this Court's opinions. If left to stand, it undoubtedly will lead to an avalanche of federal court cases challenging the constitutionality of state actions that were taken and completed in the past, cases which heretofore were plainly barred by the Eleventh Amendment. States have a strong and constitutionally legitimate interest in not being hauled into federal court for alleged actions that were fully completed long before a lawsuit was filed. This Court should accept this Petition to reaffirm this fundamental principle.

---

[11] The Court in *Papasan* went on to rule that plaintiffs' additional claim that there was a "present disparity in the distribution of the benefits of state-held assets" was not barred by the Eleventh Amendment. 478 U.S. at 281-82. Here, plaintiffs cannot allege that there is any continuing disparity with respect to distribution of refunds; as pointed out above, all refund distributions have already been completed and no more remain to be made. Thus, this latter holding in *Papasan* is inapplicable here.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted by this Honorable Court.

Respectfully Submitted,

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON
Attorney General of Missouri

DON M. DOWNING*
Deputy Attorney General

JANE E. EILERMANN
Assistant Attorney General

P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-3321

Counsel for Petitioner

*Counsel of Record

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION

Case No. 90-4207-CV-C-5

HAROLD LYNCH, TURNER TYSON,
CHARLES F. HENRY, JACK BITZENBURG,
and GEORGE A. DERRIEUX,
Plaintiffs,

and

JEAN DICKEY, GREGORY DICKEY,
RICHARD FLANAGAN, FRANKLIN HOGGARD,
MILFORD HOLT, and JAMES MENTIS,
Intervenor Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL RETIREMENT
SYSTEM OF MISSOURI; AND
JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON,
Attorney General of the State of Missouri,
in his official capacity and in
his statutory capacity,
Defendants.

FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT

[Filed April 28, 1993]

Come now Plaintiffs and Intervenor Plaintiffs (hereinafter referred to collectively as "Plaintiffs") and for their cause of action state as follows:

COUNT I — Declaratory Judgment

1. Plaintiffs bring Count I of this cause of action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201 for a judgment declaring portions of Chapters 104 and 169 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri ("RSMo") (1991 Supp.) to be unconstitutional; and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1343, for deprivations, under color of state law, of rights secured to Plaintiffs by the United States Constitution, actionable under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. §1983 and §1988.

2. The violation of Plaintiffs' rights as alleged herein was committed within the State of Missouri, and venue lies in the Central Division of the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri.

3. Plaintiffs are, and at all times relevant to this action were, citizens of the United States.

4. Plaintiffs, and each of them, were employed by the State of Missouri, prior to December 31, 1989, with one or more of the following entities: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ("DESE"), Southwest Missouri State University ("SMSU"), Southeast Missouri State University ("SEMSU"), Central Missouri State University ("CMSU"), Northwest Missouri State University ("NWMSU"), Northeast Missouri State University ("NEMSU"), Harris-Stowe State College ("HSSC"), Missouri Southern State College ("MSSC"), Missouri Western State College ("MWSC"), Department of Corrections and Human Resources ("DCHR"), Department of Mental Health ("DMH"), Department of Social Services ("DSS"), and the Division of Youth Services ("DYS"); and while so employed personally contributed to The Public School Retirement System of Missouri ("PSRS"), established under Chapter 169 RSMo.

5. This action is brought pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of the individually named

Plaintiffs and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated as former employees of the State of Missouri who participated in PSRS, with said class being more specifically set forth below. Said persons are so numerous as to make it impractical to bring them all before the court.

6. There are common questions of law and fact presented herein, and Plaintiffs' claims as hereinafter set forth are typical of the claims of all members of the overall class. Plaintiffs are qualified to and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of each and all members of the class.

7. The class consists of Subclass A and Subclass B. *Subclass A* consists of all those persons who: (a) are retired employees who were employed by the State of Missouri prior to December 31, 1989; (b) have contributed to PSRS; (c) have not been refunded their personal retirement contributions; and (d) *have commenced* receiving retirement benefits from PSRS prior to January 1, 1990. *Subclass B* consists of all those persons who: (a) were employed by the State of Missouri prior to June 14, 1989; (b) have contributed to PSRS; (c) have not been refunded their personal retirement contributions; and (d) *have not commenced* receiving retirement benefits from PSRS prior to January 1, 1990. Unless otherwise specified, the term "Plaintiffs" as used herein shall collectively refer to all members of both Subclasses.

8. Subclass A class representatives are:

Ms. Jean Dickey
Southeast Missouri State University
1110 Broadridge
Jackson, MO 63755

Mr. Gregory Dickey
1510 Route D
Jackson, MO 63755

Mr. James Mentis
Route #2, Box 68
Strafford, MO 65757

Mr. Richard Flanagan
315-B West 3rd Street
Maryville, MO 64468

Mr. Franklin Hoggard
415 East Cardinal
Springfield, MO 65810

Mr. Milford Holt
1814 Ricardo Drive
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

9. Class representatives for Subclass B are:

Mr. Harold Lynch, Director
Nichols Career Center
609 Union Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Mr. Turner Tyson
Assistant Superintendent
Jefferson City Public School District
315 East Dunklin Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Mr. Charles F. Henry
Director of High Tech. Training
Metropolitan Community Colleges
3200 Broadway
Kansas City, MO 64111

Mr. Jack Bitzenburg
Dean, Continuing Education
Penn Valley Community College
3201 Southwest Trafficway
Kansas City, MO 64111

Mr. George A. Derrieux
Assistant Superintendent
Hannibal 60 School District
4650 McMasters Avenue
Hannibal, MO 63401

10. Defendant Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon is the Attorney General of the State of Missouri and maintains his official office at the permanent seat of government in Jefferson City, Cole County, Missouri. Defendant Nixon has the powers and duties provided by the Constitution and laws of the State of Missouri. Defendant Nixon is made a party hereto in his official capacity and in his statutory capacity.

11. PSRS was specifically established as a retirement system for all public school teachers in Missouri, as defined in §169.010(16), RSMo.

12. The Missouri State Employees Retirement System ("MOSERS") was established as a retirement system for all State employees.

13. Both PSRS and MOSERS were originally set up as contributory systems, meaning that each employee personally contributed a percentage of their salary to fund their retirement plan. MOSERS is now a non-contributory retirement system, with the State of Missouri making the full contribution for all State employees who are members. PSRS is now a non-contributory retirement system for those members who are currently employed by the State, and has been non-contributory with regard to some former State employees.

14. Plaintiffs were and are similarly situated to all other employees of the State of Missouri, but are the only such persons who have neither been allowed to withdraw the personal contributions they made to their retirement system while employed by the State nor received an automatic refund of such personal contributions while remaining a member of their respective retirement system. With the exception of the Plaintiffs, all other current, former, retired and even deceased State employees have received a refund of their personal contributions made to their retirement system, plus interest, and have been allowed to remain members of their respective retirement system.

15. Plaintiffs are former employees of the State of Missouri who are members of PSRS. While Plaintiffs were employed by the State, they were arbitrarily assigned to and required to participate in and personally contribute to PSRS for their retirement. All other State employees were either not required to personally contribute to their retirement or, if they made personal contributions, were subsequently refunded their personal contributions.

16. On or about April 2, 1986, in the Western District of Missouri, United States District Court Case No. 84-4331-CV-C-5, styled *Sommer v. Bihr*, 631 F.Supp. 1388, the defendants there (including the Board of Trustees of PSRS and the Executive Secretary of PSRS) were held to be violating the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by requiring certain State employees within the Department of Corrections and Department of Mental Health to participate in the PSRS on an employee-contributory basis as opposed to having their pension benefits fully funded by their employer, as was being enjoyed by other State employees within those departments. The defendants were ordered, amongst other things, to refund all of the personal contributions of those plaintiffs to the retirement fund, with interest at the rate of six percent (6%). The decision was not appealed, and is binding

upon the Board of Trustees of PSRS and the Executive Secretary of PSRS in this action, through operation of the doctrines of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel.

17. In 1986, and subsequent to the decision in *Sommer v. Bihr*, the Missouri General Assembly ("Legislature") enacted House Bill 1496. This bill implemented the *Sommer* decision, not only for State employees within the Department of Corrections and Human Resources and the Department of Mental Health, but also for State employees within the Division of Youth Services and the Department of Social Services. The legislation specifically granted to all those State employees the right to receive a refund of all their previously paid retirement contributions, with interest.

18. In 1987, the Legislature enacted H.B. 713, which provided that employees of SMSU, SEMSU, CMSU, NWMSU, NEMSU, HSSC, MSSC, and MWSC, who were members of PSRS would receive a refund of their personal contributions, plus interest.

19. In 1989, the Legislature passed House Bill 610. This legislation was passed in part to effectuate the settlement of *Paul K. Johnson, et. al. v. David Mustoe, et. al.*, United States District Court, Western District of Missouri, Central Division, Case No. 87-4290-CV-C-9, consolidated with No. 87-4299-CV-C-9. This legislation enacted § 104.342.7(1) RSMo (1991 Supp.), allowing a refund (with "interest of at least 6%") to persons who: (a) were employed by DESE, SMSU, SEMSU, CMSU, NWMSU, NEMSU, HSSC, MSSC, and MWSC on June 14, 1989; (b) were contributing to PSRS; (c) elected to transfer to MOSERS; and (d) did not commence receiving retirement benefits prior to January 1, 1990. This legislation also enacted §104.342.7(2) RSMo, *allowing persons who elected to stay in PSRS the same refund* as was provided in §104.342.7(1) RSMo. The retirement benefits of the refund recipients were not limited by reason of the refund allowed under either of these provisions. Plaintiffs in the present

case were members of PSRS who had been employed by the employers listed above, but were not so employed on June 14, 1989.

20. House Bill 610 also enacted §169.055.8 RSMo (1991 Supp.), allowing former employees of CMSU, who had not yet retired, the option of transferring to MOSERS or remaining in PSRS, and allowing them a refund (with "interest of at least 6%") in either event. This legislation also enacted § 169.055.10 RSMo, allowing former employees of CMSU, who had retired under PSRS, the option of transferring to MOSERS or remaining in PSRS, and allowing them a refund (with "interest of at least 6%") in either event.

21. Plaintiffs have been denied a refund of all their personally contributed funds in violation of their equal protection rights. Other employees of the State of Missouri, who were similarly situated to Plaintiffs and who performed duties identical to those performed by Plaintiffs when they were employed by the State of Missouri, have received refunds of their personal contributions, even if they remained members of PSRS. Plaintiffs were and are similarly situated to those employees of the State of Missouri to whom H.B. 610 applied, but are the only such persons who have not been allowed a refund of their contributions to their retirement system, with interest.

22. The implementation and enforcement of the provisions of Chapter 104, and specifically §104.342 RSMo (1991 Supp.), causes the Plaintiffs to be denied a refund for any of their retirement contributions made while they were employed by the State. Such treatment of Plaintiffs, and members of their class, is arbitrary and capricious and bears no rational relationship to any legitimate State interest or purpose.

23. Previous orders of this Court and laws enacted by the Legislature have established and acknowledged that equal protection rights were violated when certain State employees were

required to participate in a contributory retirement system while other State employees were allowed to participate in non-contributory plans. Those previous court orders and State legislative enactments sought to correct the discrepancies that existed where one group of State employees was required to personally contribute to their retirement, while other similarly situated State employees were not required to make such personal contributions. Refunds of previously made personal contributions were mandated under the court orders and corrective legislation.

24. A justiciable controversy exists between the parties hereto. All others similarly situated to Plaintiffs, and their class members, have had their rights restored to them by final orders of this Court or by legislation passed by the Legislature, while Plaintiffs' rights remain without redress.

25. No reasonable or rational relationship to any legitimate State interest presently exists for the unequal and disparate treatment arbitrarily imposed on Plaintiffs, as compared to other identically situated State employees, who have been refunded their personal contributions along with appropriate interest.

26. By virtue of §169.060 RSMo (1991 Supp.), Plaintiffs have a protectable property interest, in that they are entitled to retirement benefits. Plaintiffs have been required to make personal contributions in order to receive such benefits, which moneys are now retained by Defendants. Plaintiffs are the only persons who have not had their personal contributions returned to them, and such retention by Defendants amounts to a taking without due process of law, in violation of the due process clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray the Court to grant to them the following relief:

A. A declaratory judgment that §104.342 RSMo. (1991 Supp.), either on its face or as applied to Plaintiffs, or both, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment in that certain property rights and privileges afforded all other State employees were not afforded to Plaintiffs; and further results in a "taking" of Plaintiffs' property without due process of law in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

B. An order awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys fees, expenses of litigation and costs herein; and

C. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper in the premises.

COUNT II —Injunctive relief

27. Plaintiffs bring Count II of this cause of action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2202, for further relief; and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1343, for deprivations under color of state law, of rights secured to Plaintiffs by the United State Constitution, actionable under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. §1983 and §1988.

28. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference, as though fully set forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 2 through 26 of this Complaint.

29. Defendant The Public School Retirement System of Missouri ("PSRS") holds the personal retirement contributions of the Plaintiffs, and is a proper party to this action, pursuant to §169.020.1 RSMo. (1991 Supp.). Any available injunctive relief must be entered against this Defendant. Defendant PSRS can be served with process by service upon David W. Mustoe, Executive Secretary, at 701 West Main Street, Jefferson City, Missouri.

30. Defendants contend that §104.342 RSMo (1991 Supp.) is constitutional on its face and in their application of it, and insist that they will continue to enforce it to the detriment of Plaintiffs.

31. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law for these deprivations of their rights and have sustained substantial and continuing losses and deprivations.

32. To properly remedy the disparate treatment of Plaintiffs, and the taking of Plaintiffs' property, Plaintiffs must be allowed to withdraw all of their past personal contributions to PSRS that were made while Plaintiffs were State employees, with interest, and allowed to receive full retirement benefits upon retirement, without any limitation of benefits as a result of such refund of personal contributions.

33. The funds which Plaintiffs are requesting to be returned are neither funds of the State of Missouri nor funds in the State treasury. These funds are personal contributions and accrued interest on moneys paid into PSRS solely by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are not asking the State for money, nor are they asking for an appropriation to replace the funds in PSRS that Plaintiff claim are rightfully theirs. A common fund made up totally and wholly of the Plaintiffs' money is the subject of this litigation and its proposed remedies.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray the Court to grant to them the following relief:

A. An order enjoining Defendants from maintaining and implementing The Public School Retirement System in a manner which violates the Equal Protection Clause;

B. An order that all personal contributions made by Plaintiffs and members of their class to PSRS while employees of the State of Missouri be refunded to them (with interest of at least 6%), and that Plaintiffs' retirement benefits shall not be limited by reason of such refund of personal contributions;

C. An order enjoining enforcement against Plaintiffs of that portion of §169.050.5 RSMo. which, in the event that all of the §104.342 RSMo is declared unconstitutional, would cause Plain-

tiffs to forfeit any creditable service they may have if their contributions are refunded.

D. Retention of jurisdiction by the Court until its orders have been properly implemented;

E. An order awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys fees, expenses of litigation and costs herein; and

F. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper in the premises, including but not limited to such relief as the Court may find appropriate and necessary to restore Plaintiffs to their full rights and privileges.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT G. BROWN AND ASSOCIATES

By /s/ Roger G. Brown
Roger G. Brown (#29055)
Keith W. Brunstrom (#38343)
216 East McCarty Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
Telephone: 314/634-8501

CARSON & COIL, P. C.

By /s/ Eugene G. Bushmann
Eugene G. Bushmann (#17111)
P. O. Box 235
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Telephone: 314/636-2177

ANDERECK, EVANS,
MILNE, PEACE & BAUMHOER

By /s/ Craig S. Johnson
Craig S. Johnson (#28179)
P. O. Box 1280
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Telephone: 314/634-3422
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing was sent by first-class mail, postage prepaid to: Mr. Jay Nixon, Attorney General, P. O. Box 899, Jefferson City, MO 65102, and to Mr. Philip A. Klawuhn, Armstrong, Teasdale, Schafly, Davis & Dicus, 1700 City Centre Square, 1100 Main Street, Kansas City, MO 64105, on this 28th day of April, 1993.

By /s/ Roger G. Brown

APPENDIX B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION

No. 90-4207-CV-C-5

HAROLD LYNCH, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

and

JEAN DICKEY, et al.,
Intervenor Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL RETIREMENT
SYSTEM OF MISSOURI, et al.,
Defendants.

MOTION TO DISMISS FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT OF DEFENDANT JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON, MISSOURI ATTORNEY GENERAL

[Filed: June 04, 1993]

Separate defendant Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Attorney General of the State of Missouri ("Attorney General") hereby moves, pursuant to Rule 12(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for an Order of Dismissal of Plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint as to this separate defendant on the following grounds:

1. Plaintiffs Fourth Amended Complaint fails to present a case or controversy; therefore this Court lacks jurisdiction under Article III of the United States Constitution.

2. The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits this suit against the Attorney General of Missouri.

3. Plaintiffs' complaint fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted.

a. Plaintiffs' complaint fails to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because the Attorney General is not a "person" under that section.

b. Plaintiffs have failed to show a deprivation of a substantive or procedural due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

c. Plaintiffs' complaint fails to state a claim for the denial of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

4. For its further reasons and authorities in support of this Motion, the Attorney General incorporates herein by this reference its Memorandum of Law in Support of this Motion filed contemporaneously herewith.

WHEREFORE, defendant the Attorney General prays the Court enter its Order dismissing with prejudice the Fourth Amended Complaint as to this defendant, that the Attorney General be discharged herefrom with his costs herein expended and incurred and for such further relief as the Court may deem just.

Respectfully submitted,

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON
Attorney General

/s/ Don Downing
DON M. DOWNING
Deputy Attorney General
Missouri Bar No. 30405

/s/ Jane E. Eilermann
JANE E. EILERMANN
Assistant Attorney General
Missouri Bar No. 43156

Broadway State Office Building
221 West High Street, 8th Floor
Post Office Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
(314) 751-8825

Attorneys for Defendant
Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon
Attorney General of Missouri

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was mailed, postage prepaid, by United States mail, this 4th day of June, 1993, to:

Philip A. Klawuhn
Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis
1700 City Center Square
1100 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL RETIREMENT
SYSTEM OF MISSOURI

Eugene G. Bushman
Carson & Coil
P. O. Box 235
Jefferson City, MO 65102

AND

Roger G. Brown
216 East McCarty Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

Craig S. Johnson
Stockard Andereck Hauck Sharp & Evans
301 E. McCarty Street
P. O. Box 1280
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENORS
/s/Jane E. Eilermann
JANE E. EILERMANN

APPENDIX C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
CENTRAL DIVISION

No. 90-4207-CV-C-5

HAROLD LYNCH, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

and

JEAN DICKEY, et al.,
Intervenor Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL RETIREMENT
SYSTEM OF MISSOURI, et al.,
Defendants.

ORDER

[Filed August 20, 1993]

Before the Court are separate motions to dismiss plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint by defendant Jeremiah Nixon ("the Attorney General") and by defendant Public School Retirement System ("PSRS"). For the following reasons, both motions to dismiss are granted.

On April 5, 1993, this Court granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants and gave plaintiffs leave to file an amended complaint naming the Missouri Attorney General as a defendant. Plaintiffs filed their Fourth Amended Complaint on April 28, 1993. Count I seeks a judgment declaring that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.342 violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and results in a "taking" of plaintiffs' property without due process of law in violation of the due

process clause of the Fifth Amendment. Count II seeks injunctive relief against PSRS, ordering it to provide refunds of "all of [plaintiffs'] past personal contributions to PSRS that were made while plaintiffs were state employees, with interest, and [that plaintiffs be] allowed to receive full [PSRS] retirement benefits upon retirement."

This Court's April 5, 1993 Order removed PSRS as a party. Because that Order stands as law of the case, PSRS's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint is granted.

This Court concludes that plaintiffs' allegations against the Attorney General are barred by the Eleventh Amendment because plaintiffs do not seek prospective relief. Generally, a suit brought against a state or a state agency is proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment. *Papasan v. Allain*, 106. S.Ct. 900, 907-08. However, a state official who violates the United States Constitution acts without state authority and is subject to suit. *Ex Parte Young*, 28 S.Ct. 441, 453-54 (1908). A state official who enforces an unconstitutional statue falls under this rubric, and a court may enjoin the official from future enforcement of the statute. Courts may also award a wide range of prospective relief, even if the relief has a "substantial ancillary effect on the state treasury." *Edelman v. Jordan*, 94 S.Ct. 1347, 1357-58 (1974); *Nix v. Norman*, 879 F.2d 429, 432 (8th Cir. 1989). Plaintiff may sue a state agent in his or her official capacity if she seeks only injunctive or prospective relief for a legally cognizable claim. *Nix, Id.* Furthermore, state officials sued in their official capacities for injunctive relief are "persons" under § 1983 because official capacity suits for prospective relief are not considered suits against the state. *Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 2311 n.10 (1989).

Here, the relief sought by plaintiffs is retroactive in nature. There is simply no ongoing violation of federal law. Any alleged violation of federal law occurred in 1987 and 1989 when the then

present state employees received refunds of their pension contributions to the exclusion of plaintiffs under § 104.342. As the Attorney General notes, the refund scheme was fully completed in 1987 and 1989. The Attorney General does not continue to enforce the statute because it has already been fully implemented. This Court may not issue a declaratory judgment finding that the state or state official violated federal law in the past when there is no ongoing violation of federal law. *Green v. Mansour*, 106 S.Ct. 423, 438 (1985). Plaintiffs seek a cash reimbursement of their contributions because they allege the state violated their constitutional rights in the past when it did not grant them refunds. This request amounts to a retroactive damage award which is barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *See*, *Edelman*, 94 S.Ct. at 1358.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that defendant Public School Retirement System's motion to dismiss is granted. It is further

ORDERED that defendant Jeremiah Nixon's motion to dismiss is granted.

/s/ Scott O. Wright
SCOTT O. WRIGHT
Senior United States District Judge
August 20, 1993

APPENDIX D

-UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 93-3357

Harold Lynch; Turner Tyson;
Charles F. Henry; Jack Bitzenburg;
George A. Derrieux;

Plaintiffs-Appellants

Nancy Samp; Bob Chapman;
William K. Goodrick; Donald
Kelly; Larry Lutz;

Plaintiffs;

Jean Dickey; F. Gregory
Dickey; James Mentis; Richard
Flanagan; Franklin Hoggard;
Milford Holt;

Intervenor-Plaintiffs, Below-Appellants;

v.

Public School Retirement
System of Missouri, Board of Trustees;

Defendant-Appellee;

Billy H. Blankenship; Joseph
Rhoads; Deborah Scanlon;

Intervenor-Plaintiffs Below;

William M. Brent, Chairman,
Board of Trustees, individually
and in his official capacity;
Laurel S. Cochennet, Member,
Board of Trustees,
individually and in her official capacity;
Theresa Reger; William J. Wasson, Board
of Trustees, individually and

in his official capacity;
David W. Mustoe, Executive
Secretary, Board of Trustees,
individually and in his
official capacity;
Defendants;
Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon;
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal From the United States District Court
for theWestern District of Missouri

Submitted: May 12, 1994
Filed: June 20, 1994

Before BOWMAN, Circuit Judge, HEANEY, Senior Circuit Judge, and BEAM, Circuit Judge.

HEANEY, Senior Circuit Judge.

Former state employees who contributed to the Public School Retirement System of Missouri (PSRS) brought a class action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 challenging a statutory scheme under which they are denied refunds of their personal retirement contributions while other persons allegedly similarly situated have received such refunds. The district court dismissed the former employees' complaint, holding that PSRS, its trustees, and its executive secretary were not proper defendants and that plaintiffs' claim was barred by the Eleventh Amendment because they were seeking retroactive relief. We reverse and remand for a determination of whether the statutory provisions violate equal protection or amount to an unconstitutional taking of property.

This matter is before the court for the second time. It was first here on an appeal from a district court order denying without prejudice

the PSRS defendants' motion for judgment on qualified and Eleventh Amendment immunity grounds and allowing discovery on all issues. *Lynch v. Public School Retirement System*, No. 92-3484 (8th Cir. Jan. 6, 1993). We determined that we had "jurisdiction to review a discovery order that is issued before motions asserting immunity are conclusively resolved, but does not limit discovery to the issue of immunity." *Id.* at 3. We remanded with instructions to resolve the issue of defendants' immunity to suit before allowing discovery to proceed as to other issues.

On remand the district court granted summary judgment to the PSRS defendants but directed the clerk not to enter judgment at that time. *Lynch v. Public School Retirement System*, No. 90-4207-CV-C-5, sli p op. at 8 (W.D.Mo. Apr. 5, 1993). The court granted judgment on the ground that the plaintiffs had not sued the parties who allegedly violated their constitutional rights. *Id.* at 7. It reasoned that because the plaintiffs implicitly sought to have portions of Mo. Rev. Stat. § 104.342 declared unconstitutional, plaintiffs must sue the Missouri Attorney General in his official capacity for an injunction prohibiting future implementation of the statute. The court stated that PSRS "could not grant refunds to the plaintiffs without legislation directing them to do so. These defendants did not decide to refuse refunds to these plaintiffs; the General Assembly made that decision. Only the General Assembly can show that it had a rational basis for that decision." *Id.* at 7-8. The court granted the plaintiffs twenty-five days to file an amended complaint "nam[ing] the proper defendants." *Id.* at 8.

The plaintiffs subsequently filed a fourth amended complaint adding the Missouri Attorney General as a defendant. The plaintiffs sought a declaratory judgment that portions of chapters 104 and 169 of Missouri Revised Statutes violate equal protection and result in a taking of plaintiffs' property without due process of law in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Plaintiffs also sought injunctive relief to prohibit defendants from maintaining and

implementing the retirement system in a manner that violates the Equal Protection Clause; require PSRS to refund to plaintiffs their past personal contributions to the retirement system, with interest; prohibit enforcement against plaintiffs of the portion of section 169.050.5 which, in the event that all of section 104.342 is declared unconstitutional, would cause them to forfeit any creditable service they may have if their contributions are refunded; and such other relief as may be appropriate.

The district court subsequently granted separate motions by the Attorney General and PSRS to dismiss the fourth amended complaint. *Lynch v. Public School Retirement System*, No. 90-4207-CV-C-5 (W.D. Mo. Aug. 20, 1993). The court first held that its April 5, 1993, order had removed PSRS as a party and that the order stood as law of the case; the court thus granted PSRS's motion to dismiss. The court then granted the Attorney General's motion to dismiss, concluding that the Eleventh Amendment barred plaintiffs' claims because they were seeking retroactive rather than prospective relief:

> This Court may not issue a declaratory judgment finding that the state or state official violated federal law in the past when there is no ongoing violation of federal law. Plaintiffs seek a cash reimbursement of their contributions because they allege the state violated their constitution rights in the past when it did not grant them refunds. This request amounts to a retroactive damage award which is barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

Id. at 3 (internal citations omitted).

We do not agree with the district court that PSRS had previously been dismissed from the case and that this action was law of the case. The district court's April 5, 1993, order specifically directed the clerk of court "*not* to enter judgement at this time" (emphasis in original). Judgment on this issue was not entered until the August 20, 1993, order, which was timely appealed by

the plaintiffs. Thus the issue as to whether summary judgment was appropriately granted as to PSRS is properly before us.

We conclude that summary judgment in favor of PSRS and the Attorney General was not appropriate. The district court gave two reasons for its decision, neither of which withstands scrutiny. The first was that even if the challenged statutory provisions were found to violate the Equal Protection Clause, PSRS lacked authority to refund the plaintiffs' personal retirement contributions. The court reasoned that only the legislature could require such refunds. The plaintiffs, however, not only sought refunds but alternatively requested any other relief that might be appropriate. Under the latter alternative, the district court at least could require PSRS to recover the refunds already made pursuant to an unconstitutional scheme.

The district court's second reason was that the Eleventh Amendment bars relief because plaintiffs seek retroactive rather than prospective relief. *See Green v. Mansour*, 474 U.S. 64 (1985). We disagree. If the statutory scheme is in fact unconstitutional, the continued implementation of such a scheme constitutes an ongoing violation of federal law, regardless of whether some or all persons similarly situated to plaintiffs have already received their refunds.

At this time we need not determine the outer limits of the district court's authority to order particular remedies, such as refunds to the plaintiffs.[1] It is sufficient for now to say that the district court clearly has the authority to find the statutory scheme unconstitutional and to order an appropriate remedy.

---

[1]We note, for example, that in *Sommer v. Bihr*, 631 F. Supp. 1388 (W.D.Mo. 1986), the district court ordered refunds of personal retirement contributions to employees of the Departments of Corrections and Mental Health after concluding that statutory provisions requiring those employees to participate in a contributory retirement system violated equal protection when other similarly situated employees participated in a noncontributory retirement system.

The fighting issue in this case has been and continues to be whether there is a rational basis for excluding the plaintiffs from the benefits of amendments to chapters 104 and 169 of Missouri Revised Statutes that permitted some present and past employees to obtain refunds of their personal retirement contributions. The legislation can only be declared unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment if there is no rational basis for distinguishing between the plaintiffs and other past and present employees who have received refunds of their personal retirement contributions. *See Western & Southern Life Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, 668, (1981). In determining the answer, the court must decide whether the challenged legislation has a legitimate purpose and whether it was reasonable for lawmakers to believe that use of the challenged classification would promote that purpose. *Id.*

We reverse the dismissal of the plaintiffs' complaint and remand for an evidentiary hearing. The district court shall make findings of fact and conclusions of law on whether there is a rational basis for the challenged statutory scheme and whether an unconstitutional taking of property occurred. We retain jurisdiction over this case and direct the district court to certify its findings to this court.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U. S. COURT OF APPEALS,
EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

APPENDIX E

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 93-3357WMJC

Harold Lynch, et al.,
Appellants,

v.

Public School Retirement System
of Missouri, etc., et al.,
Appellees.

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing and
Suggestion For Rehearing En Banc

The suggestions for rehearing en banc are denied. The petitions for rehearing by the panel are also denied.

Judge Hansen took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

August 11, 1994

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:
/s/Michael E. Gans
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit